



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

11/1
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,082	12/06/2001	Linden Minnick	42390P12249	3183
8791	7590	10/07/2005	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			MADAMBA, GLENFORD J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2151		

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/007,082	MINNICK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Glenford Madamba	2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/13/2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to amendments filed on July 13, 2005.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed July 13, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regards to independent Claim 1, Applicant argues that Johnson does not describe, expressly or inherently, a NIC that is "operative to moderate one or more interrupts of an associated computing platform processor, based at least in part on the at least a portion of said contents, as required by, for example, claim 1. Specifically, Applicant also argues that in Johnson, a NIC monitors a buffer to determine when to initiate a data transfer to system memory, but not when to generate an interrupt of a processor of its computing platform. The Office respectfully submits that Applicant has misinterpreted the prior art of record, and maintains that the requirements of the claim are indeed disclosed by the Johnson prior art, as the following discussion below will show.

Johnson, for his invention, discloses a computer system for communicating with a network including a host processor, memory, an interface bus and a network interface device (e.g. NIC) for reducing data transfer latency between the computer system and the network. The network device includes a buffer for temporarily storing data, a media interface device for transferring data between the computer system's memory and the buffer, and a local processor writing a unique value at a predetermined location within the buffer, for periodically comparing the data value at the predetermined location with the unique value and for initiating data transfer from the buffer to the computer's memory when the data value does not match the unique value [Abstract].

In his description for related art, Johnson discloses that data is typically transferred across network segments in the form of packets or frames. A NIC usually includes a buffer or the like for temporarily storing data transferred between a computer system and a network. He further teaches that latency is a measure of the amount of time or delay to transfer a packet or packet portion to the main memory of the computer. Johnson additionally discloses that in many Ethernet and token ring schemes prior to his invention, an entire block of data was written into the buffer for temporary storage before being transferred to the main memory. Each block formed a portion of a packet or the entire packet. Transfer of each block from the NIC to the main memory depended upon whether the NIC was capable of performing direct memory access data transfers. If so, after a block was written to the buffer of the NIC, the NIC gained control

of the expansion bus of the computer and performed a DMA transfer of the block into the computer memory. For memory-mapped configurations, the NIC informed the host processor (that data was available for transfer prior to performing the data transfer), usually by interrupt, and the host processor controlled the transfer of the data from the buffer to the computer memory [col 2, lines 26-51] [col 6, lines 37-47] [col 6, line 62 – col 7, line 19].

In addition, Johnson also discloses using Figure 5B a timing diagram illustrating another prior art scheme for transferring blocks of data; where the bus interface device is configured as a bus slave rather than being capable of performing DMA transfers. In this memory-mapped configuration, each block of data for each packet from the segment is stored in the buffer beginning at a time T20 and ending at a time T22 upon assertion of either the EOB or EOF signals. At time T24 after a delay D4, the host processor is notified that a new block resides in the buffer to be transferred to main memory. As before, notification of the host processor is handled by asserting an interrupt signal. The host processor respondingly begins executing a routine to transfer the data, which begins at a time T26 after another delay D5. The data transfer performed by the host processor is completed at time T28 [col 7, lines 41-60]. Thus, Johnsons discloses prior art methodology for initiating and controlling the generation of an interrupt signal to the host processor that a block of data has been added to the buffer of a NIC and is available for transfer, prior to the actual performance of the data transfer by the host processor, for a memory-mapped configuration systems; as well as a method for indicating (notifying the host processor via an interrupt signal) to the

computer system after the data from the data buffer is transferred, providing notification of data transfer, which is also taught by Johnson and which Applicant has pointed out and argued.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the Johnson and Drottart references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, introduction of the Drottart prior art in view of Johnson illustrates that I/O packet formats having headers that include a field for ACK/NAKs as one of its components, is a standard feature and is well known in the art. As pointed out by Drottart, the packet format of his invention allows for a positive acknowledge (ACK) to be sent to check for error in packet transmission while observing link-based flow control [col 10, lines 48-65]. Drottart also teaches that including a MAC header in the I/O packet improves processing efficiency and speed of packets at each intermediate node or switch compared to other packet formats [col 16, lines 1-12].

Since it has been shown that Johnson teaches a NIC that is "operative to moderate one or more interrupts of an associated computing platform processor, based at least in part on the at least a portion of said contents", and that a host processor may

be notified of a data transfer either before or after a data transfer occurs, the combination of Johnson and Drottar thus teaches the claim limitations described by claims 2, 4, 12, 13, 21, and 22, and the rejection of the claims stand.

Likewise, since it has been shown that Johnson teaches a NIC that is "operative to moderate one or more interrupts of an associated computing platform processor, based at least in part on the at least a portion of said contents", and that a host processor may be notified of a data transfer either before or after a data transfer occurs, the combination of Johnson and Gentry thus teaches the claim limitations described by claims 6-10, 15-19, and 24-28, and the rejection of the claims are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson, U.S. Patent 5,905,874.

3. Claim 1 discloses an apparatus comprising: an input/output (I/O) device **210** [Figure 2 and 3]; said I/O device being operative to receive a fragment of electronic data [Col 2, Lines 27-42], and further being operative to identify at least a portion of the contents of said fragment of electronic data [Col 3, Lines 33-41 & Col 4, Lines 13-22], and further being operative to moderate one or more interrupts of an associated computing platform processor, based at least in part on the at least a portion of said contents [Col 2, Lines 48-51].

Claims 11 and 20 state the same limitations as Claim 1 above, and are rejected for the same reasons as they differ only by their statutory category.

4. Claim 3 recites the apparatus of claim 1, wherein said I/O device comprises a network interface card (NIC) **210** [Col 2, lines 13-26; Col 3, lines 15-32; Figure 2 and 3].

5. Claim 5 stipulates the apparatus of claim 1, wherein said I/O device is configured to moderate by substantially immediately asserting said one or more interrupts of said associated computing platform processor [Col 2, lines 48-51 & Col 7, lines 52-56].

Claims 14 and 23 state the same limitations as Claim 2 above, and are rejected for the same reasons as they differ only by their statutory category.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2, 4, 12, 13, 21, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drottar et al (hereinafter Drottar), Patent Number 6,333,929.
3. Claim 2 asserts the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the at least a portion of said contents comprises an acknowledgement (ACK).

Johnson teaches in his invention that data is typically transferred across network segments in the form of packets or frames. Further, the data transferred and written into the buffer of an I/O device, such as a network interface device (NIC), are written in blocks of data that are in the form of packets or portions of packets (fragments) [Col 2, Lines 27-42]. Johnson does not disclose that the portion of said contents of said fragment of data specifically comprises an acknowledgement (ACK).

Drottar, in his invention for formatting and transmitting network packets over a distributed computer system, discloses a packet format that includes a transaction header **640** and a media access control (MAC) header **650** [Col 3, lines 6-9; also Col 11, lines 16-19; Figure 6]. As can be seen in the format for data packets with a MAC header, the header format includes a field for an ACK/NAK identification and processing [Col 13, lines 1-7; also see Col 10, lines 59-67].

It would therefore be obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include the packet formatting features employed by Drottar's invention into Johnson's to improve packet switching speed and processing efficiency in the transmission of data [Col 16, lines 1-12].

Claims 12 and 21 state the same limitations as Claim 2 above, and are rejected for the same reasons as they differ only by their statutory category.

4. Claim 4 maintains the apparatus of claim 1, wherein at least a portion of said contents comprises a priority designation [Drottar, Col 2, lines 31-33; also Col 16, lines 1-12 & 25-39].

Claims 13 and 22 state the same limitations as Claim 4 above, and are rejected for the same reasons as they differ only by their statutory category.

5. Claims 6-10, 15-19, 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gentry Jr., Patent Number 6,434,651.

6. Claim 6 points to the apparatus of claim 1, wherein said I/O device is configured to moderate by deferring said one or more interrupts of said associated computing platform processor so that a predetermined number of interrupts per unit of time is not exceeded.

For his invention, Johnson discloses a computer system that includes a host processor, memory, an interface bus and a network interface device (NIC) for communicating with a network [Col 3, lines 16-20]. The NIC informs the host processor that a block of data was received and that a DMA transfer of data has been performed into the computer memory, via an interrupt [Col 2, Lines 40-51]. Johnson does not disclose that the network interface device is configured to moderate by deferring one or more interrupts of the host processor so that a predetermined number of interrupts per unit of time is not exceeded.

Gentry, Jr., in his invention for modulating or suppressing the issuance of interrupts from a communication device such as a NIC [Col 1, lines 6-10], discloses an apparatus whereby interrupts normally generated when packets are received by a NIC and transferred to a host processor are alternately enabled and disabled. In

particular, after one interrupt is issued to and serviced by a host processor, another interrupt is not generated until a *predetermined period of time* has passed for a specified amount of network traffic has been sent to the host computer system. [Gentry Jr., Col 7, lines 37-47 & 51-56; also Col 8, lines 1-11 & 39-67]

It would therefore be obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the interrupt suppression features in Gentry Jr.'s invention into Johnson's so that a host processor can be more responsive to other tasks (e.g. user activity) and to decrease the amount of processor time used to process network traffic, by modulating the number of network interrupts generated by a network interface device [Gentry Jr., Col 7, lines 29-36].

7. Claim 7 states the apparatus of claim 1, wherein said I/O device is configured to moderate by deferring said one or more interrupts until a particular number of fragments of electronic data of a particular type are received by said I/O device [Gentry Jr., Col 7, lines 19-36, 47-56, & 63-67; Col 8, lines 1-11 and 39-67].

Claims 16 and 25 state the same limitations as Claim 1 above, and are rejected for the same reasons as they differ only by their statutory category.

8. Claim 8 cites the apparatus of claim 1, wherein said I/O device is configured to moderate by deferring said one or more interrupts until a particular quantity of electronic data is received [Gentry Jr., Col 7, lines 47-56, & 63-67; Col 8, lines 1-11].

Claims 17 and 26 state the same limitations as Claim 1 above, and are rejected for the same reasons as they differ only by their statutory category.

9. Claim 9 states the apparatus of claim 1, wherein said moderation of associated computing platform interrupt scheme is configurable through a user interface [Gentry Jr., Col 7, lines 51-56; Col 8, lines 3-11].

Claims 18 and 27 state the same limitations as Claim 1 above, and are rejected for the same reasons as they differ only by their statutory category.

10. Claim 10 identifies the apparatus of claim 1, and further comprising: said I/O device further being operative to measure a particular period of time after the receipt of a fragment of electronic data, and further being operative to moderate one or more interrupts of an associated computing platform after said particular period of time has elapsed [Gentry Jr., Col 7, lines 37-47 & 51-56; also Col 8, lines 39-67].

Claims 19 and 28 state the same limitations as Claim 1 above, and are rejected for the same reasons as they differ only by their statutory category.

11. Claim 15 identifies the method of claim 11, wherein said moderating comprises deferring said one or more interrupts of said associated computing platform processor if a predetermined number of interrupts per unit time is met or exceeded [Gentry Jr., Col 7, lines 37-47 & 51-56; also Col 8, lines 39-67].

12. Claim 24 states the article of claim 20, wherein said moderating comprises deferring said interrupting of said associated computing platform processor [Gentry Jr., Col 1, Lines 5-10; Figure 1; also Col 7, lines 10-18].

Conclusion

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

1. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenford Madamba whose telephone number is 571-272-7989. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3932. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Glenford Madamba
Examiner
Art Unit 2151



ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER